UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,281	03/15/2001	John M. Hall	10004375-1	8897

7590 05/24/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/810,281	HALL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin R. Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 4 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-21 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/30/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See Remarks below.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik.

Regarding claim 18, a method of providing user-relative addressing in a computer network (Weik: col. 2, lines 7-18; lines 37-43), the method comprising:

receiving a communication including destination information (Weik: col. 3, lines 28-29; salutation; col. 2, lines 30-43) and sender identification information (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-54) the destination information including a first sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; col. 3, lines 28-29; salutation);

determining whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; col. 3, lines 20-25);

accessing a sender record based on the received sender identification information (Weik: the black and white list are records of addresses that are compared with the sender-specific data);

providing action information identifying a plurality of actions associated with a plurality of sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; black list= forwarded to address for scrap functions; white list forwarded for further processing);

identifying a first action in the action information based on the received destination information (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; black list= forwarded to address for scrap functions; white list forwarded for further processing based on sender-specific data), the first action associated with the first sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- 47; forward to);

identifying a first attribute in the sender record based on the first action and the received destination information (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-64; attribute is the match);

determining a first absolute destination based on the first attribute (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; where it is forwarded to based on sender-specific data and match in white or black list record).

Claims 1-6, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 by Agraharam et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik.

Regarding claim 1,

The Agraharam reference teaches a method of providing relative addressing in a computer network environment (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 24-28), the method comprising:

associating a plurality of relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24);

receiving a first relative destination for a communication (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 52-56);

receiving identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 56-59);

identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24); and

determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24; Figure 2).

The Agraharam reference does not explicitly state identifying the sender.

The Weik reference teaches identifying the sender (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-54) and destination information from an email (Weik: col. 3, lines 20-30).

The Weik reference further teaches the invention improves the handling of email to achieve a more effective control over message workflow (Weik: col. 1, lines 17-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of relative addressing as taught by Agraharam while identifying sender information and destination information as taught by Weik in order to improve the handling of email to achieve a more effective control over message workflow (Weik: col. 1, lines 17-33).

Claims 2-6 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al and Weik.

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1, wherein the network includes a directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first action and the sender identification information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; Weik: col. 2, lines 44-54; col. 3, lines 4-9).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 2, wherein the directory server is an LDAP server (Agraharam: col. 4, liens 1-12).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1, wherein the identification information is an email address (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 55).

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 1, wherein the user identification information is a name (Agraharam: col. 5, lines 24-37; col. 3, lines 56-69; telephone number is like a username).

Regarding claim 6, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is an email address (Agraharam: col. 3, line 66).

Regarding claim 14,

The Agraharam reference teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of providing relative addressing in a computer network (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 24-28) comprising:

associating a plurality of relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24);

receiving a first relative destination for a communication (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 52-56);

receiving identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 56-59);

identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24); and

determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24; Figure 2).

The Agraharam reference does not explicitly state identifying the sender.

The Weik reference teaches identifying the sender (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-54) and destination information from an email (Weik: col. 3, lines 20-30).

The Weik reference further teaches the invention improves the handling of email to achieve a more effective control over message workflow (Weik: col. 1, lines 17-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of relative addressing as taught by Agraharam while identifying sender information as taught by Weik in order to improve the handling of email to achieve a more effective control over message workflow (Weik: col. 1, lines 17-33).

Claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al and Weik.

Regarding claim 15, the medium of claim 14, wherein the network includes a directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first action and the sender identification information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; Weik: col. 2, lines 44-54; col. 3, lines 4-9).

Claims 7-10, 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 by Agraharam et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 by Takahashi.

Regarding claim 7,

The Agraharam and Weik references teaches the method of claim 1, of relative addressing in email.

The Agraharam and Weik references do not explicitly state forwarding to more than one email address.

The Takahashi reference teaches the destination is a plurality of email addresses (Takahashi: col. 7, lines 2-10; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam and Weik while forwarding to more than one email address as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Claims 8-10 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al, Weik, and Takahashi et al.

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is a fax phone number (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 9, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is a plurality of fax phone numbers (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 1, and further comprising providing a mapping table that associates the plurality of sender-relative destinations with the corresponding plurality of actions (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 16,

The Agraharam and Weik references teach the medium of claim 14, relative addressing in email.

The Agraharam and Weik references do not explicitly state forwarding to a fax number.

The Takahashi reference teaches wherein the first absolute destination is a fax phone number (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the medium of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam and Weik while forwarding to a fax number as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al, Weik, and Takahashi et al.

Regarding claim 17, the medium of claim 14, wherein the method further comprises providing a mapping table that associates the plurality of sender-relative destinations with the corresponding plurality of actions (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

Claims 19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 by Agraharam et al.

Regarding claim 19,

The Weik reference teaches the method of claim 18 for providing user-relative addressing.

The Weik reference does not explicitly state a directory server.

The Agraharam reference teaches wherein the network includes a directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein a record is accessed from the directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first attribute (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; col. 3, lines 59-66).

The Agraharam reference further teaches

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of user relative addressing as taught by Weik while using a directory server as taught by Agraharam in order store and retrieve necessary associated email address information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 3-12).

Claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al and Weik.

Regarding claim 21, the method of claim 18, and further comprising:

accessing a plurality of employee records based on the first action (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; looking up the translation data);

comparing a first attribute in each employee record with the first attribute in the sender record (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 51-66; Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; Weik compares sender-specific data with the list and Agraharam teaches pulling data from a LDAP list);

identifying employee records with a first attribute that matches the first attribute of the sender's record (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-64);

determining a plurality of absolute destinations based on the identified employee records (Agraharam: col. 3, line 66; col. 4, lines 1-12; Weik: col. 2, lines 62- col. 3, line 3).

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 by Takahashi.

Regarding claim 20,

The Weik reference teaches the method of claim 18, for user-relative addressing.

The Weik reference does not explicitly state a mapping table.

The Takahashi reference teaches a mapping table that associates the plurality of actions with the plurality of sender-relative destinations (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the medium of user relative addressing as taught by Weik while using a mapping table as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 by McDowell et al.

Regarding claim 11,

The Weik reference teaches a network device configured to be coupled to a computer network (Weik: Figure 1, tag 10), the network device comprising:

a receiver for receiving a communication (Weik: col. 1, lines 34-42; Figure 1, tag 1), the communication including destination information and sender identification information (Weik: col. 1, lines 36-52; col. 2, lines 37-43);

search information identifying searches associated with sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, lines 20-25; lines 37-44); and

a controller coupled to the receiver, the controller configured to: identify whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-44; col. 3, lines 21-34); perform at least one search based on the stored search information and the sender identification information if the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61); and identify at least one absolute destination based on the search (Weik: col. 2, lines 62-66).

The Weik reference does not explicitly state a directory server.

The McDowell reference teaches LDAP with a directory server (McDowell: col. 6, lines 12-18; Figure 12) and memory (McDowell: col. 16, lines 8-20) to find an absolute destination for the email to be forwarded to (McDowell: col. 3, lines 38-64).

The McDowell reference further teaches the invention overcomes lost email because of defunct email addresses by eliminating bouncing of inaccurately addressed emails with the forward file (McDowell: col. 1, lines 29-42).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the network device for searching sender information from a communication as taught by Weik while utilizing a directory server to forward the message as taught by McDowell in order to reduce lost and bounced email (McDowell: col. 1, lines 29-42).

Claims 12-13 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Weik and McDowell et al.

Regarding claim 12, the network device of claim 11, wherein the memory stores a mapping table that includes the search information identifying searches associated with sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61; McDowell: col. 4, lines 52-55).

Regarding claim 13, the network device of claim 11, wherein the memory stores an address resolving process (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61), and wherein the controller is configured to identify the at least one absolute destination based on information in the stored mapping table and in the stored address resolving process (Weik: col. 2, lines 62-66; McDowell: col. 4, lines 52-55).

REMARKS

The examiner has corrected the typos and has clarified some citations to better point out the teachings of the prior art.

The Applicant Argues:

With regards to claim 18, applicant argues the Weik reference does not specify "a sender-relative destination in a communication, or looking at destination information in a communication and determining the type of destination information specified."

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Nothing in claim 18 mentions determining the "type of destination information specified" nor does it specify doing something different based on this data.

With special focus to "the destination information including a first sender-relative destination," the destination information is the recipient information and the first sender-relative destination is the recipient but depends on how it is related to the sender.

The Weik reference does teach a sender-relative destination. Email is sent with a destination or recipient in mind. This is inherent in all email communications with the to: field to address the email to a party. Weik teaches the recipient information in col. 3, lines 28-29 as the salutation in which messages are processed. Email messages are processed to the destination or one or more special addresses based on upon their evaluation. Evaluation can be comparing the sender identification data against the white and black lists (Weik: col. 2, lines 31-43). The assignment criteria relates to sender-specific data of the incoming email, particularly "name or email address of the sender." Weik col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3 teaches and illustrates the processing of the email if the sender-specific data comparison with black and white lists are positive. If the black list comparison produces a positive match, an action is taken whether it be erased, stored, or forwarded, to a special address. Similarly if a positive match is generated from the white list comparison, the email is passed on for further processing to be stored under, or forwarded to, a special address in parallel to the further processing of the email.

The examiner does not interpret the black and white lists disclosed as sender-relative destinations. The destinations are the intended recipient of the email that sender-relative based on sender identification. Weik teaches the action is based on the received destination information (col. 3, lines 20-25). Weik teaches the first attribute in the sender record as the positive or negative match of the criteria of the email with the predetermined assignment criteria like the presence of the email data with the white and black lists.

With regards to claims 1 and 14, applicant has amended the claims to change user-relative addressing to sender-relative addressing.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

As admitted Agraharam does not teach the sender related address but Weik does as argued and illustrated above. The examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to combine the two prior art patents with motivation to teach the claimed invention.

With regards to applicant's remarks about examiner's remarks,

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Weik reference teaches the limitation "identify the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination." The destination of the email is the intended recipient as argued above in claim 1 (col. 3, lines 21-34) and it is identified by the invention to see if it meets the predetermined criteria (col. 4, lines 6-13).

The examiner believes that applicant is reading too much into the limitation "sender-relative destination" without further defining it and encourages applicant to further define these terms with specifics and how the sender relates to the destination information.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb BRB

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100